DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 450 854 JC 010 238

AUTHOR	Redmon, Kent D.
TITLE	Faculty Evaluation in Community Colleges: A Response to Competing Values. An ERIC Review.
PUB DATE	1999-00-00
NOTE	20p.
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	College Administration; *College Faculty; *Community Colleges; *Evaluation Methods; *Faculty College Relationship; *Faculty Evaluation; Portfolio Assessment; Professional Development; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

This report discusses the effects of the "competing values" of community college administrators and faculty members on faculty evaluation programs. College administrators and faculty often have different perceptions about why an appraisal process is implemented. Community college administrators share a belief that their institutions should be stable, accountable, and in control of faculty and staff. Faculty members, on the other hand, generally share a belief that administrators should be more willing to share resources and power, and allow for creative growth and development in teaching. Because of the competing values, more fuel has been added to the debate over the perceived purpose of faculty evaluation. A review of documents and journal articles entered into the ERIC database since 1983 suggests that one faculty evaluation approach that emerged as a result of the competing values is a "procedural approach." Under this approach, self-evaluations are combined with appraisals made by peers, administrators, and students on an ongoing basis to accumulate a body of evidence that is used for both formative and summative appraisals. A second approach is the "developmental approach," which involves faculty members in the creation of teaching portfolios, dossiers, and self-evaluations that describe teaching strengths and accomplishments while participating in faculty development programs. Contains 28 references. (JA)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 450 854

Faculty Evaluation in Community Colleges: A Response to Competing Values

An ERIC Review

Kent D. Redmon

Associate Professor of Speech Communication

Parkland College

EAF Doctoral Student, Illinois State University

Kent D. Redmon

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

TC010238

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"As concerns grow about faculty quality and accountability, legal responsibilities for administrators concerning tenure and dismissal, and improvement of the overall state of education, colleges must strive to devise the best means possible to evaluate faculty" (McGee, 1995, p. 341). The use of faculty evaluations by community college administrators as a tool to address concerns about faculty quality, institutional accountability and educational improvement continue to be of the utmost importance for community colleges across the United States. The use of faculty evaluation to assess the work of full-time faculty can be a wicked issue because college administrators and faculty members are frequently at odds over the purpose that an evaluation is supposed to serve. College administrators and faculty often have different perceptions about why an appraisal process is implemented. Community college administrators share a belief that their institutions should be stable, efficient, predictable, accountable and in control of it's faculty and staff. Faculty members on the other hand, generally share a belief that administrators should be more willing to share resources and power, allow for creative growth and development in teaching, and allow for greater adaptability in showcasing their professional growth. These fundamental differences are what Quinn (1981) has come to call "competing values." Quinn asserts that:

> We want our organizations to be adaptable and flexible, but we also want them to be stable and controlled. We want growth, resource acquisition, and external support, but we also want tight information management and formal communication. We want an emphasis on the value of human resources, but we also want an emphasis on planning and goal setting (p. 49).

Given the perceived importance of faculty evaluation in community colleges, this ERIC review focuses on answering the question, "what impact has the competing values of community college administrators, and faculty members had on faculty evaluation?" This review will discuss two outcomes of the competing values on faculty evaluation programs. The first outcome is that more fuel has been added to the debate over the perceived purpose of faculty evaluation. The second outcome is that two broad approaches to evaluating faculty have emerged, each seeking to address the competing values of faculty and administrators.

Purpose for Evaluation

Any discussion of the approaches used to assess faculty must begin with a clear understanding of what faculty evaluation is designed to achieve in the first place. Regardless of the steps taken by community college administrators to show institutional accountability or to provide feedback to faculty members about their performance, it is generally agreed that the primary purpose of the evaluation is to aid administrators in reaching formative and summative goals. Generally speaking, the evaluation approaches used by community college administrators will be formative, summative, or some combination of both a formative and summative evaluation processes. A formative evaluation, as described by Centra (1993), "is used to improve teaching performance; the information is given to teachers, whether it is obtained from students, colleagues, or faculty development specialists, and is meant to bring about positive changes. In contrast, summative evaluation is used to make personnel decisions-to hire, promote, grant tenure, or give a merit raise" (p. 5). Additionally, Smith (as cited in Rifkin, 1995) observed the following, "faculty evaluation has a formative purpose-the results are used to support faculty development, growth, and self-improvement. On the other hand, faculty evaluation has a summative purpose—the results are used to make personnel decisions on tenure, promotion, reappointment, and salary" (p. 64).

The purpose faculty evaluation serve, continue to be a source of controversy. In his review of the literature on faculty and administrator evaluation, Palmer (1983) introduces a point about the contradictory nature of faculty evaluation purposes. He says, "faculty evaluation systems often have two contradictory purposes: to enhance faculty development efforts by assessing the strengths and weaknesses of individual instructors and to determine whether the employment of a faculty member should be continued or terminated" (p. 110). He goes on in his review to quote Cohen (1974) who observes that: "One faculty evaluation scheme cannot both judge and assist. The procedure that gathers evidence for dismissal is different from that which reflects a climate of support, of communication, and of growth inducement" (p. 21). Mark (as cited in Palmer, 1983) asserted that, "most writers on the subject concur with Cohen", and that, "... there has been little research into how the two goals of evaluation can be separated...The outcome is more judgement and less assistance" (p. 110).

After Palmer (1983) reviewed the literature on faculty evaluation, it is not surprising that twelve years later, in her review of the literature on faculty evaluation in community colleges, Rifkin (1995) also refers to the same quote by Cohen (1974, p. 21) and makes note of the controversy over formative and summative evaluation. She, however, concluded that: "The inability to devise faculty evaluation programs that separate formative and summative purposes has fueled the argument that support incorporating both purposes in the evaluation process" (p. 64). Rifkin goes on to point out that, "even though formative evaluation is considered a primary purpose of faculty evaluation among faculty and administrators, research suggests that perceptions of how the results are used interferes with the overall success of evaluation systems that attempt to incorporate both purposes" (p. 66).

Suggesting that faculty evaluation is something other than faculty development, implies that the evaluation process must be summative (Andrews, 1991; Cohen, 1974; and Arreola, 1983). There is no consensus on this view. Generally speaking, authors who suggest that faculty evaluation be "supportive," "contribute to personal growth," or be "non-threatening" are arguing for an evaluation process that is formative (Dockery, 1994; Murray, 1994; Nolte, 1997; and Olp, 1991). ERIC documents in this review which "add fuel" to this debate include Rifkin, (1995); Dockery (1994); Wolverton (1996); Murray (1994); Defina (1996); and Centra (April, 1993) who each suggest that the teaching portfolio, as an approach to faculty evaluation, provide the best opportunity to combine both formative and summative evaluation into one comprehensive faculty evaluation process. The portfolio will be discussed later in this review.

The Procedural Approach

A review of documents and journal articles entered into the ERIC database since 1983 suggests that one faculty evaluation approach having emerged as a result of the competing values of community college administrators and faculty members is a "procedural approach." Under the procedural approach, self-evaluations are combined with appraisals made by peers, administrators, and students on an ongoing basis to accumulate a body of evidence that is used for both formative and summative appraisals. This approach emerged primarily out of a need felt by college administrators and various stakeholders to exercise institutional control in order to assure quality teaching, student satisfaction, and institutional accountability. This procedural approach also came about as community college faculty gained more

power at the bargaining table. A procedural approach is characterized by input from faculty members and administrators; an emphasis on teaching; and the use of student, colleague, administrator, and self as sources of information for the evaluation (Ackerman, 1996; Smith and Barber, 1994; and El Paso County Community College District, 1996). The guidelines for a procedural evaluation will vary from college to college and from department to department, but the basic procedure involves the following steps: First, a pre-evaluation meeting between faculty member and department chairperson or dean to discuss the goals, objectives, and agreed upon items to be evaluated. Second, a classroom visit during the evaluation period by the department chairperson or dean to observe the faculty member's teaching style. Third, The faculty members being evaluated compile a self-evaluation, student evaluation rating forms, and a list of professional development activities. Fourth, a performance review conference is set up at the end of the evaluation period between faculty members and department chairman or dean. Fifth, the department chairman or dean renders some type of judgement based n the collected data. As a final step, the faculty member can appeal if the appraisal is not satisfactory (Ackerman, 1996; Smith and Barber, 1994; and El Paso County Community College District, 1996).

This ERIC review suggests that a procedural approach to evaluating full-time faculty at community and two-year colleges is common. Renz (1984) mailed a survey to a random sample of 210 two-year colleges to examine, among other things, the procedures used to obtain information in the evaluation system. Of the 210 colleges surveyed, 141 responses were returned from which data was collected. He found that most of the elements outlined in a comprehensive theoretical model derived from current literature are those also practiced in some form nationally (p. 6). McGee (1995) conducted a study of eleven two-year colleges to collect information about their faculty evaluation programs. This study revealed that all eleven schools used some form of organized student evaluation instrument, ranging in length from 9 to 27 Items. All eleven schools used periodic administrative evaluations of faculty by the department chair, dean, or office of instruction. And, all eleven schools used annual, semiannual, or quarterly review for non-tenured faculty and a review every 2 to 3 years for tenured faculty. McGee concluded, "in general, the administrative review procedure consisted of compiling reports from peer groups, as well as student and self-evaluations, and writing evaluations of faculty members based on these data, including the

administrators' own observations" (pp. 343-344).

The Procedural Approach in Action

What does the future hold for procedural evaluations at community colleges? As long as there are competing values among administrators and faculty members this approach is likely to continue. A review of procedural evaluation practices utilized by administrators at four different community colleges confirms this prediction. College administrators at Arizona Western Community College, Oklahoma Community College, Central Oregon Community College, and Pueblo Community College have each experienced success with a procedural approach to faculty evaluation. Each college has experienced success in planning, developing, and implementing faculty evaluation systems that allow them to promote professional growth, and at the same time make personnel decisions. As an illustration, Olp and others (1991) share their experience at Arizona Western Community College. At Arizona Western College a task force made up of twelve persons, representing a cross-section of the teaching population was formed. This task force then created and distributed surveys to faculty members in an attempt to get them to define components of their job and rate each component on its relative importance.

In conjunction with the faculty survey, the AWCC administrators implemented a procedural evaluation that consisted of the following steps:

1. Each instructor and his or her division chairman select two classes to be appraised;
2. Students (a primary source of information) rate faculty using a scanner form to comment on areas of the instructor's classroom teaching;
3. Faculty members rate themselves using another rating form. Faculty members also detail in writing their service and professional growth;
4. Department chairmen rate each of their faculty members on appropriate aspects of teaching and in the areas of service and professional growth;
5. The ratings forms are scanned and computer processed. Each division chairman is then provided with a printout on which the student mean scores and faculty self scores for each statement is reflected;

6. An interview takes place between the faculty member and division chairman to compare the ratings; and

7. The chairmen then prepare a summary report with recommendation about professional growth and personnel decisions.

The evaluation system at Arizona Western College was riddled with problems. So, the task force decided to turn the first year of the comprehensive evaluation into a pilot. This pilot, first utilized in 1991, consisted of using a random selection of faculty from each division. The aim of the pilot was to check out the system and locate erroneous instructions, scanner problems, and errors on some of the forms. This pilot enabled the task force to make adjustments to the system and resulted in tested and error-free evaluation tools ready for use (Olp and Others, 1991).

Oklahoma Community College is another example of how administrators have utilized a procedural evaluation process to contend with some of the competing values existing between and among administrators and faculty members. Ackerman (1996) reports that administrators at Oklahoma Community College evaluate their full-time faculty members by following four broad and flexible steps. The first step involves a meeting between faculty persons and the dean to discuss goals, expectations, activities, and areas of emphasis for the upcoming year. Areas of emphasis might include instructional effectiveness, professional development, and college and professional activities. The Oklahoma Community College evaluation process places an emphasis on mutual agreement. That is, what gets included the evaluation (sources of information, performance categories, or the level of emphasis for each performance category) is not a part of the evaluation if it is not agreed to by both the faculty person and dean.

The second step in the evaluation process at Oklahoma Community College may involve a discussion between faculty person and dean on matters related to performance as the need arises. In this step, either the faculty person or dean may request a mid-year performance review conference. Here, mutually agreed upon changes in goals and expectations may be made as a result of a mid-year conference. The faculty person and dean will discuss any input obtained to that date that relates to performance.

The third step in the process is the annual performance review and evaluation conference, which takes place at the end of the evaluation period. Each performance indicator will be reviewed using standard and

agreed upon sources of input, the faculty person's self-evaluation, and the dean's observations. Each performance category is evaluated and assigned a performance rating, and then an overall rating is determined in accordance with the college performance appraisal program. The last step of the process may involve an appeal by the faculty member requesting a follow-up conference with the dean. If not resolved, the faculty person submits a written statement of the case to the Director of Human Resources. A performance review hearing committee is formed The review committee functions to ensure that the faculty member was treated and evaluated fairly and not to change the performance rating. The review committee then reports the findings to the Vice President who will then make the final decision in the matter (Ackerman, 1996, pp. 5-6).

One of the strengths of the Oklahoma Community College procedural evaluation process is the flexibility given to faculty members. The notion that only mutually agreed upon items are included in the appraisal probably appeals to many faculty members because it can be seen as a form of shared governance. On the down side, however, Ackerman (1996) does not provide an explanation of what may happen to the evaluation process at Oklahoma Community College if the faculty person and dean cannot agree on what needs to be included in the appraisal. Nor is there an explanation of what (at a minimum) must be included in the process of evaluating full-time faculty members. Unlike the other three colleges listed in this section, which provide a list of what "must" be included in the evaluation process, Oklahoma Community College suggests that everything in the evaluation process is subject to negotiation between the faculty person and dean.

Central Oregon Community College (April, 1997), attempting to address the competing values of administrators, faculty members and students, also represent an example of how administrators have implemented a procedural approach to evaluating their full-time faculty. At Central Oregon Community College components for evaluation, categories for evaluation, and the timeline for evaluation are all predetermined by the administration. First, the components for evaluation are clearly identified. A designated evaluator, peer evaluation, administrative evaluation, student evaluation, and an annual self-report are all sources of information for the evaluation process. Administrators at Central Oregon Community College identify performance in primary assignment, professional improvement, service to

the college, and service to the community as the categories for evaluation.

Central Oregon Community College also establishes a timeline for evaluation. Every year all faculty are expected to compile student evaluation forms from all sections taught, submit an annual report of activities to the Vice President via designated evaluator by October 15th, and discuss student evaluations, annual report of activities and professional improvement plan with the designated evaluator. Central Oregon Community College administrators use different steps for evaluating pre and post-tenured faculty. Faculty evaluation differs based on first or second year of service, and the year prior to promotion or tenure. Tenured faculty members undergo a complete evaluation every fourth year of service to the college.

The process of evaluating faculty members who approach the year prior to promotion or tenure review, or who approach their alternate fourth year of service involve seven steps. Step one; the designated evaluator (usually the department chairman) meets with faculty member and peer team to establish responsibilities and goals. Peer teams are used for summative evaluation purposes after the faculty member's first year, and is made up of the designated evaluator, one member from the faculty member's department and one member from outside the faculty member's department/division. Step two; a pre-visitation conference between the faculty member and evaluator is established. Step three; class visits and review of class materials take place. Step four; a post-visitation conference between faculty member and evaluator is arranged. Step five; a summative report is submitted to the faculty member. Step six; the designated evaluator provides a written evaluation including summary of peer evaluation reports, (Reports submitted to personnel file.) Step seven, when a faculty member approaches consideration for the rank of full professor, the faculty member and designated evaluator jointly decide whether to conduct the review in the fourth year or the year prior to promotion (central Oregon Community College, 1997).

A unique feature of the Central Oregon Community College practice of evaluating full-time faculty members is that some type of evaluation takes place each year for every faculty member. Faculty members who are in their post-tenure years are expected to address student evaluations, monitor their professional activities, and discuss their progress with the department chairman. Another unique feature of the practices used by Central Oregon Community College administrators to evaluate their full-time faculty is that every expectation for the appraisal process is detailed in writing. Specific instructions are provided for

conducting peer evaluations, compiling student evaluations, conducting classroom visitations, the roles to be played by evaluators, and the criteria for what and who is to be evaluated. For community colleges looking for a model to emulate, the Central Oregon Community College model is worthy of consideration.

Pueblo Community College is another illustration of how administrators have implemented a procedural evaluation program to assess the work of their faculty. In order to be considered for monetary rewards for excellent teaching, a faculty member must follow guidelines, which include a specified timeline, professional growth plan, classroom observation, student evaluation, self-evaluation, and supervisor evaluation. The first step involves a conference between supervisors and faculty member to discuss criteria, schedule, and procedures to be used in the evaluation. The evaluation will be conducted after 60 to 80 percent of the scheduled hours have been completed.

The second step involves the faculty member preparing an annual professional growth plan. Completing this plan is required for any monetary rewards in the merit pay system. Faculty members submit growth plans to their immediate supervisor by the end of the second week in October and the final draft of the growth plan by the first Monday in November. The growth plan can be modified as the year unfolds.

The third step for faculty members at Pueblo Community College involves a classroom observation by the immediate supervisor. The faculty member and supervisor will arrange a conference to discuss the classroom observation. The appraiser will also conduct a post-observation conference to discuss the results of the observation.

The fourth step involves student evaluations. Each faculty member will be evaluated by students in two classes or labs after at least 60, and no more than 80 percent of the scheduled hours have been completed. The faculty member being evaluated will choose one class, and his/her immediate supervisor will choose the second class.

The next step is the faculty member's self-evaluation. In the merit pay process, no points are awarded for the faculty self-evaluation. The faculty member completes the appropriate forms and follows the specific guidelines establish by Pueblo Community College administrators.

The final step involves the supervisor evaluation. Department chairs, co-chairs, or program coordinators

have the responsibility for evaluating faculty serving in their department(s). In assigning points for teaching effectiveness, supervisors will consider the results of the classroom observation plus any additional material provided by faculty (May, 1998, pp. 35-42).

Unlike the other colleges discussed previously, Pueblo Community College administrators have taken advantage of an opportunity to tie merit pay increases to faculty evaluation. The faculty professional advancement and salary plan, established by the State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education in Colorado, promotes and rewards teaching excellence within the system. The Pueblo Community College evaluation plan rewards excellent teaching above and beyond the awarding of tenure Merit pay is directly connected to faculty evaluation at Pueblo Community College (May, 1998, p. 15).

The Developmental Approach to Faculty Evaluation

A second approach growing in popularity, is a "developmental" one. The developmental approach involves faculty members in the creation of teaching portfolios, dossiers, and self-evaluations that describe teaching strengths and accomplishments while participating in faculty development programs. This approach emerged as a result of faculty members' need for shared governance, greater flexibility, and concerns about professional growth.

What does a developmental approach consist of? How does the developmental approach differ from the procedural approach discussed earlier? A large part of the developmental approach combines the use of teaching portfolios with faculty development programs. According to Seldin (1993) a teaching portfolio is, "a factual description of a professor's teaching strengths and accomplishments. It includes documents and materials which collectively suggest the scope and quality of a professor's teaching performance" (p. 2). Wolverton (1996) reported that portfolios are, "akin to those used by artists to display their best work" (p. 295). Dockery (1994) suggests that a teaching portfolio, "provides a record of actual teaching activities that can be compared with an institution's and a department's own standards of teaching and excellence, it includes the very back-up evidence needed by persons making personnel decisions" (p. 4). DeFina (1996) asserts that, "one's self-assessment can be ongoing through the structure of a teaching portfolio. Updated each year, it becomes a record of achievements" (p. 4). And Murry (1994) maintains that, "the power of a portfolio is found in its ability to become a tool for an individual to reflect on the real task of education-

teaching" (p. 3).

What then is a faculty development program? A faculty development program is a tool in assisting faculty members to solve problems or achieve goals that both they and the administration consider to be important (Arreola, 1983 p. 84).

The Developmental Approach in Action

What does the future hold for the developmental approach? This remains to be seen. A review of the developmental evaluation practices utilized by faculty members and administrators at three different community colleges suggest that the developmental approach take some getting used to. Faculty members and administrators at Flathead Valley Community College, Miami Dade Community College, and Ulster County Community College each claim some success with the developmental approach after some initioal resistance from faculty members and administrators was overcome. As an example, Faculty members and administrators at Flathead Valley Community College (FVCC) in Montana decided to utilize a developmental evaluation approach in response to a mandate from the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges (Nolte and others, 1997 p. 4). According to Nolte and others (1997) a Personnel Committee, comprised of five full-time faculty members elected by the members of the faculty union, plus two additional faculty members and the Academic Dean with experience in developing faculty evaluation approaches, was charged with the development of a revised faculty evaluation process. The Personnel Committee at FVCC is a standing committee with a stated purpose to improve instruction. This committee sought and received feedback from faculty and administrators at the college. The Personnel Committee at FVCC also reviewed evaluation procedures used at other colleges, the literature on faculty evaluation, and the history of faculty evaluation at FVCC. Using their review findings in conjunction with feedback from the college community the Personnel Committee at FVCC decided to utilize a developmental approach to faculty evaluation. This approach combined teaching portfolios with faculty development plans. The Personnel Committee at FVCC found the following: that teaching portfolios provide the faculty member with feedback from a variety of sources. That teaching portfolios shift the burden of work to the faculty, yet provides the most flexibility. That one of the consistent themes in the literature "is that administrators must be willing to give up control of the process to faculty" (p. 6). The Personnel Committee also found

that "the literature suggests the need to emphasize that the portfolio is for faculty self-improvement and renewal-formative not summative" (p.6). The FVCC developmental approach makes use of teaching portfolios that contain six elements: An evaluation plan, an instructional evaluation, a professional-related evaluation, a self-evaluation, a professional development plan, and a Division Chair/Supervisor evaluation.

The Faculty Personnel Committee at FVCC decided to run the revised faculty evaluation process as a pilot. One third of the faculty was designated to participate in the pilot year of the new evaluation process. The process for the evaluation would work the following way:

First, post-tenured faculty members will be evaluated once every three years. Immediately prior to the evaluation year, faculty members develop their individual evaluation plans and submit them to the Dean via the Division Chair. Next, at the completion of their evaluation year, and upon review of their evaluation prior to submitting their portfolio, faculty develop their individual professional development plans for inclusion in their portfolio, calling upon their Division Chair or the Dean for advice or guidance (p.8)

The Faculty Personnel Committee at FVCC allows for a great deal of latitude and flexibility in the development of the evaluation plan by faculty members. One important thing to keep in mind about the process used by FVCC is that the faculty members and administrators made it clear from the outset that the entire post-tenure evaluation process would be formative.

Arguably, FVCC faculty and administrators experienced success because faculty members were given flexibility and control with their pilot evaluation process noting that:

"Faculty members have been consistently serious, thoughtful, and creative in their self-evaluations and professional development plans; that the feeling of cooperation and trust between faculty and administration has been strengthened" (p. 7).

What happens however, when a developmental approach used by college faculty groups, and administrators is designed to meet both formative and summative goals? The answer to this question can be determined by reviewing the evaluation process at Miami Dade Community College in Miami, Florida.

The use of a teaching portfolio process by administrators and faculty groups at Miami-Dade community College to evaluate the performance of faculty members, initially turned out to be an attempt at forcing a square peg into a round hole. The portfolio evaluation process, spearheaded by Miami-Dade's

Teaching/Learning Project, sought to impact the classroom effectiveness of its teachers by tying a comprehensive professional development program to a faculty-designed and administered advancement system. This faculty development system consists of graduate courses, new faculty orientation and mentoring, fully staffed resource centers on each campus, pay for all tuition and supply costs for those who enroll in the graduate courses. The Miami-Dade advancement system awards continuing contract, tenure, promotion and endowed teaching chair positions based on teaching portfolios.

Faculty groups and administrators mandate the majority of what goes into the teaching portfolios at Miami-Dade Community College; leaving faculty members with little latitude for creativity or flexibility. Because of this, the Miami-Dade portfolio system, which attempts to utilize faculty development programs, is actually a procedural approach in disguise. The Miami-Dade portfolio system has the following mandates in exercising the portfolio process: First, the portfolios must reflect a core of fundamental characteristics of faculty excellence as related to teaching and learning. Second, each portfolio must contain a minimum 20-page narrative. Third, inclusion of three annual performance reviews conducted by the faculty member's department chair is required. Fourth, three sets of student feedback surveys and unspecified documentation of each of the 29 attributes is required. Fifth, all documentation items were to be cross-referenced with the narrative. Sixth, promotion depended very heavily on a faculty member's ability to verify competency in prescribed numbers of these traits

What lessons were learned by faculty groups and administrators at Miami-Dade? Selden and Associates (1993) reports that one lesson learned was that there needed to be some limits placed on the size of the portfolio. There was a 20 page narrative section required so most faculty members wrote a 20 page narrative when fewer pages would have sufficed. Also, most faculty over -stated their cases and expressed fears about whether they had enough material (p. 50).

Another lesson learned was that if the portfolio is to be made critical to the professional advancement of faculty members, it is essential that:

1) Faculty and administrators support the basic concept of the use of the portfolio; 2) faculty have a significant say in the policies and procedures that govern the use of the portfolio; 3) clear guidelines be given for portfolio construction and evaluation; and 4) sufficient training be provided to all individuals

involved prior to implementation

Another lesson learned by faculty groups and administrators at Miami-Dade in 1993 after two portfolio go-rounds, was that the evaluation system would have to be monitored and revamped from time-to-time. Wolverton (1996) states that:

Under the revised faculty advancement system, the content requirements of the teaching portfolios changed. Specific reference to the 29 attributes has been eliminated... The portfolio now begins with a job description, followed by narrative and documentation sections. The job description is new. The narrative (shortened to no more than 15 pages) focuses on a series of questions, which can be answered in either essay or short answer format. By making the structure of this portion optional, designers hope they have allowed for individual faculty differences in style. For instance, math and science teachers like the prescriptiveness of answering questions; English and social science instructors enjoy the creativity that writing an essay affords them (pp. 302-303).

An important note about the evaluation process at Miami-Dade Community College is that when faculty members and administrators began the first go-round of portfolio assessment in 1991, they were actually in a procedural approach mode; exercising a great deal of stability and control over the process. As the evaluation system matured over the next couple of year with administrators realizing that more faculty input and flexibility were needed, the system became more developmental in its approach. An important lesson to be learned is that the mere use of a portfolio does not make for a developmental approach.

Discussion

The teaching portfolio, combined with faculty development services at many community colleges has recently been lauded as an alternative to traditional modes of teacher evaluation. That is, instead of using the procedural approach discussed earlier or using a singular type of evaluation (student, peer, supervisor, or self-evaluation) the best substitute would be the teaching portfolio or a college's faculty development program (Wolverton, 1996; Defina, 1996; Seldin, 1993; Rifkin, 1995; Licata and Anderews, 1992). Are there any major differences between the developmental approach and the procedural approach? It can be argued that the differences between the two approaches are differences in the competing values which

justify the utilization of both a procedural and a developmental approach at any community college where the needs of the institution must be weighed against the needs of its faculty and staff. Using the writings of Hammons (1983); Seldin and Associates (1993); Wolverton (1996); Defina (1996); Dockery (1994); Quinn (1988); and Murry (1994) ten major value differences between the developmental approach and the procedural approach are outlined below in table 1.

Table 1. Some value differences between developmental and procedural approaches to faculty evaluations.

Values	Developmental Approach	Procedural Approach
Who "owns" the evaluation	Faculty member.	Institution
What is the outcome of the evaluation?	A work in progress used to promote professional growth.	A finished product used for making personnel decisions.
Who has a voice in the evaluation process?	Collaborative. All involved.	Prescriptive. The Department Chairs and Administrators.
What types of questions are posed in the evaluation process?	Reflective questions, examining "why?"	Analytical questions, examining "what?"
What is the external institutional focus of the evaluation process?	To adapt to and accommodate an increasingly diverse student population and clientele.	To showcase productivity and efficiency to various federal, state, and county stakeholders.
What is the internal institutional focus of the evaluation process?	Flexibility and creativity.	Control and stability.
What is the organizational emphasis of the evaluation process?	Toward decentralization and differentiation.	Toward centralization and integration.
What is the role of the supervisor in the evaluation process?	To counsel, help and guide.	To judge.
In what context is the performer appraised during the evaluation process?	Future performance, the performer's potential?	Past performance, the performer's compliance.
What is the role of the faculty member in the evaluation process?	Active. The faculty member is involved in learning.	Passive. The faculty member typically resorts to defending him/herself.

Can the developmental approach be used for both formative and summative purposes? A review of the literature suggests that a developmental approach, making use of teaching portfolios, can be used for both formative and summative ends. For example, Nolte and others (1997) at Flathead Valley Community College, Montana; Wolvertaon (1996) while at Miami Dade Community College, Florida; and DeFina (1996) at Ulster County Community College, New York each suggest that portfolio evaluations can be used for both formative and summative purposes. Centra (April, 1993) who conducted a study of 97 faculty members at a community college, suggests that the teaching portfolio can be used for one purpose or the other. In reviewing the process at Miami-Dade Community College, it would appear that using the portfolio for one purpose or the other is sound advice. Dockery (1994) who presented a paper on portfolios to the international Conference for Community College Chairs, Deans, and other Instructional Leaders, also suggest that the teaching portfolio can be used for one purpose or the other, provided the system is clear. Seldin and Associates (1993) would concur with this point after reviewing nine colleges and universities that decided to use portfolios to evaluate faculty and staff , but would suggest that portfolios are primarily for formative purposes.

Conclusions

While there are differences between a developmental and procedural approaches to faculty evaluation, there are also some similarities. Both approaches draw upon multiple sources of information, both approaches involve input from college administrators; both approaches involve a self-report, and both approaches can have administrators who attempt to use them for formative and summative appraisals.

One could argue that a system of evaluation, which seeks to judge and assist at the same time, is a system at odds with itself. However, considering the need for community college administrators and faculty members to address the competing values existing within the college community, the attempt to combine procedural and developmental remedies will continue.

WORKS CITED

Andrews, H. A. (1991). Negative impact of faculty contract negotiations on community college faculty Evaluation systems. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 343 628).

Ackerman, A. (1996, February). Faculty performance review and evaluations: Principles, guidelines, and successes. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. Ed 394 566).

Arreola, R. A. (1983). Establishing successful faculty evaluation and development programs. In Al Smith (Ed.), Evaluating faculty and staff, pp. 83-93. New directions for community colleges, No. 41.

Bode, R. K. & Menges, R. J. (March, 1997). Feedback seeking and receiving by college and university faculty. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 406 902).

Centra, J. A. (1993). Reflective faculty evaluation: Enhancing teaching and determining faculty effectiveness. Jossey-Bass Publishers: San Francisco.

Centra, J. A. (April, 1993). Use of the teaching portfolio and student evaluations for summative evaluation (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 358 133)

Cohen, A.M. (1974). Evaluation of Faculty. Community College Review, 2 (2), 12-21.

Central Oregon Community College. (1997, April). Faculty evaluation official practices. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 420 357).

Defina, A. (1996, February). An effective alternative to faculty evaluation: The use of the teaching Portfolio. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. Ed 394 561).

Dockery, M. & Others. (1994, February). Performance review aerobics: Exercises which systemize the process. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 368 443).

El Paso County Community College. (1996, May). Procedure for tenure review and recommendations. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 409 959).

Hammons, J. (1983). Faculty development: A necessary corollary to faculty evaluation. In Al Smith (Ed.), Evaluating faculty and staff, pp. 75-82. New directions for community colleges, No. 41.

Licata, C. M. & Andrews, H. A. (1992). Faculty leaders' responses to post-tenure evaluation practices. Community/Junior College Quarterly, v16, 47-56.

Mark, S. F. (1977). Faculty evaluation systems: A research study of selected community colleges in New Your State. Albany State University of New York, Faculty Council of Community Colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 158 809).

May, J. (1998, March). Revised faculty compensation, evaluation, and advancement plan. Pueblo Community College. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 420 342).

McGee, R.L. (1995). Faculty evaluation process in 11western community colleges. Community College Journal of Research & Practice. 19 (4), 341-348

Murray, J. P. (1994, February). The teaching portfolio: The department chairperson's role in creating a climate of teaching excellence. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 368 410).

Nolte, W. & Others. (1997, February). Faculty evaluation, portfolio development, and accreditation: Walking the tightrope. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 407 011).

Olp, M. & Others. (1991, October). Appraisal of faculty: Encouragement and improvement in the classroom. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. Ed 336 159).

Palmer, J. (1983). Sources and information: Faculty and administrator evaluation. . In Al Smith (Ed.), Evaluating faculty and staff, pp. 109-118. New Directions for Community Colleges, No. 41.

Renz, F.J. (1984). Study examining the issues of faculty evaluation. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 243 559).

Quinn, R. E. (1988). Beyond rational management. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Rifkin, T. (1995). ERIC Review: Faculty Evaluation in community colleges. Community College Review, 23 (1), 63-72.

Seldin, P & Associates. (1993). Successful use of teaching portfolios. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing

Smith, Al. (1983). A conceptual framework for staff evaluation. In Al Smith (Ed.), Evaluating faculty and Staff, pp. 3-18. New Directions for Community Colleges, No. 41.

Smith, A.B., & Barber, J.A. (1993). Faculty Evaluation and performance appraisal. In Cohen, A.M., & Brawer, F.B. (1993). Managing Community Colleges: A handbook for effective practice. (pp. 382-399). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Spencer, P. A. & Flyr, M. L. (1992). The formal evaluation as an impetus to classroom change: Myth or reality? ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 349 053.

Wolverton, M. (1996). Teaching portfolios: The experience at Miami-Dade community college. Journal of General Education, 45 (4), 295-305.